

REMARKS

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for his review of the application and pending claims. In response to the office action of 10/03/06, the Applicants have amended claims 1, 19, 10 and 14. Claims 1-18 are currently pending.

35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 14-18 stand rejected since the term computer useable medium may apply to both tangible and intangible media. As a result, Applicant has amended independent claim 14 to indicate that the medium is "tangible." As a result, it is believed that this rejection is overcome.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conmy (US 2001/0014867) in view of Henneuse (U.S. 5,963,913).

Independent claims 1, 10, and 14 have been amended to better define the subject matter of the inventions.

Claim 1 requires that an event creator publishes a web page that an invitee can interact with. The invitee accesses the web page and in response to interaction with the web page creates a schedule request. The schedule request is sent to the server and the server creates an event record. This event record is then linked to the invitee's calendar. Similarly, claim 14 that is directed to a computer program product includes similar limitations.

The reference to Conmy is directed to electronic calendaring with group scheduling. The electronic calendar system allows an event creator to access the calendars of invitees. See paragraph 11. This is in sharp contrast to the present invention in which an invitee interacts with a web page to schedule an event in the invitee's calendar. In the present invention as claimed, an event creator publishes a web page that an invitee can interact with. The interaction creates a schedule request that is sent to the server. The server creates an event record.

The server then causes a link to be added from the event record to the invitee's calendar.

The Conmy reference clearly lacks the creation of an event record as the result of the invitee's interaction with a web page published by the event creator. The office action cites paragraphs 64 through 67 and 83 suggesting that these paragraphs teach the creation of a scheduling request, the creation at the server of an event record, and the creation of a link between the event record and the calendar of the invitee. Paragraphs 64 through 67 discuss the ability of the scheduling system to allow an invitee to accept an invitation and have that event be scheduled in both the calendar of the invitee and the calendar of the event creator. No separate event record is created by the scheduling system of Conmy. The events are directly placed in the calendars without a separate record being formed. As previously stated, the present invention as claimed creates an event record and then adds at least a link to the invitee's calendar. In the dependent claims, a link is also added to the event creator's calendar. The Conmy reference clearly lacks these features.

The Henneuse patent does not teach the missing elements of the Conmy reference. The Henneuse patent describes a schedule planning system and not a calendaring system (See the Abstract). None of the participants in the Henneuse system maintain a calendar. In Henneuse, a person wishing to schedule an event (a scheduler) uses a client application to access a server. The scheduler provides a number of available times along with e-mail addresses of invitees to the server through the client application. In response, the server sends e-mail to each of the invitees and within the e-mail is a link to a web-page for accepting the event or providing an alternative time and/or place for the event. As stated in the abstract, the schedule planning system finishes by sending a message to each participant to provide the decided schedule for the event.

As a result, The Henneuse patent can not create a link between an event record and the calendar of the invitee as required by the independent claims,

since there are no calendars. In addition, Applicant notes that the Henneuse patent like the Conmy reference lacks the creation of an event record that is separate from the calendar of the event creator and the invitee.

Thus, since both references lack at least the creation of an event record and the creation of a link between the event record and the calendar of the invitee, independent claims 1, 10 and 14 are allowable over the cited art of record. Neither the Henneuse patent or the Conmy reference either alone or in combination teaches all of the limitation of the independent claims.


Dependent claims 2-9, 11-13, and 15-18 each depend from an allowable independent claim and add at least one additional limitation. Therefore these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims.

It is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and issuance of a notice of allowance are respectfully requested.

If any matter arises which may expedite issuance of a notice of allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned, at the telephone number given below.

If any additional fees are required for the timely consideration of this application, please charge deposit account number 19-4972.

Respectfully submitted,


John J. Stuckevers
Registration No. 39,387
Attorney for Applicant

BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston MA 02110-1618
Tel: 617 443 9292 Fax: 617 443 0004
02857/00106 560863.1